restauranteurs have found that they can turn over that table now
that there has been a smoking ban because, in fact, the driver,
nicotine, has driven the smokers away from the table quickly.
They come in, they eat and they leave, and they go outside so
they can smoke, and that frees up the table for other customers.
More customers means more dollars, more income, more tips for
the workers and certainly more income for the restaurants. So
we have not seen that this has been an economic disadvantage.
Mr. President, I'd like to give the remainder of my time to
Senator Thompson, if I could.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Thompson, about 2, 08.

SENATOR THOMPSON: Thank you. I'd like to withdraw this
amendment and refile it on Select.

SENATOR CUDABACK: AM0948 is withdrawn. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment to the committee
amendments, Senator Bourne, AM1052. (Legislative Journal
page 1092.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bourne, you're recognized to open on
AM1052 to the committee amendments.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, if you
can...I believe that this amendment is what was LB 730, and I'm
scrolling down. I apologize. I didn't...I thought we were
going to hear a close and have a vote, and I...actually, no,
this amendment...this amendment would say that any...actually,
it would say that a city of the primary class that adopts an
ordinance that's more stringent than the state's Clean Indoor
Air Act would not receive tobacco...would not receive the
proceeds from the sale of cigarettes. As you know, there's
taxes on cigarettes and this amendment would say if you adopt an
ordinance that is more stringent than the state law you would
not receive the proceeds of cigarette tax revenues. And I'll
tell you the reason that I did this, and that's to encourage a
consistent statewide policy. I didn't do this to be punitive.
I didn't do this to make a point. I just simply tried to
reflect what the federal government does constantly. And we've